Exhibit A

	Page 1		
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3			
4	IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE) No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC		
	(CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION) MDL No. 1917		
5)		
)		
6)		
	This Document Relates to:)		
7)		
	ALL ACTIONS)		
8)		
9			
10			
11			
12	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL		
13			
14	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ALAN S. FRANKEL, Ph.D.		
15	Los Angeles, California		
16	Thursday, July 10, 2014		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21	Reported by:		
22	SHANDA GABRIEL		
23	CSR No. 10094		
24			
25			

	Page 2		
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3			
4	IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE) No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC		
	(CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION) MDL No. 1917		
5)		
)		
6)		
	This Document Relates to:)		
7)		
	ALL ACTIONS)		
8)		
9			
10			
11			
12			
13	Videotaped deposition of ALAN S. FRANKEL,		
14	Ph.D., taken on behalf of the Defendants at		
15	2049 Century Park East, Los Angeles, California,		
16	commencing at 9:07 a.m., Thursday, July 10, 2014,		
17	before SHANDA GABRIEL, CSR No. 10094.		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	FOR BEST BUY:
4	ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI LLP
5	BY: ROMAN M. SILBERFELD, ESQ.
6	DAVID MARTINEZ, ESQ.
7	2049 Century Park East
8	Suite 3400
9	Los Angeles, California 90067-3208
10	(310) 552-0130
11	rmsilberfeld@rkmc.com
12	dmartinez@rkmc.com
13	
14	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS TARGET CORPORATION AND VIEWSONIC
15	CORPORATION:
16	CROWELL MORING
17	BY: ROBERT McNARY, ESQ.
18	515 South Flower Street
19	40th Floor
20	Los Angeles, California 90071-2258
21	(213) 443-5590
22	rmcnary@crowell.com
23	
24	
25	

	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS ABC APPLIANCE, INC., COMPUCOM
4	SYSTEMS, INC., INTERBOND CORPORATION OF AMERICA,
5	MARTA COOPERATIVE OF AMERICA, INC., ELECTROGRAPH
6	SYSTEMS, INC. AND ELECTROGRAPH TECHNOLOGIES CORP.,
7	TECH DATA CORP. AND TECH DATA PRODUCT MANAGEMENT,
8	INC., SCHULTZE AGENCY SERVICES, LLC ON BEHALF OF
9	TWEETER NEWCO, LLC AND TWEETER OPCO, LLC, P.C.
10	RICHARD & SON LONG ISLAND CORPORATION, OFFICE DEPOT,
11	INC.:
12	BOISE, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
13	BY: KYLE SMITH, ESQ.
14	30 South Pearl Street
15	11th Floor
16	Albany, New York 12207
17	(518) 434-0600
18	ksmith@bsfllp.com
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 5
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS SEARS AND KMART:
4	KENNY NACHWALTER
5	BY: RICHARD ALAN ARNOLD, ESQ.
6	1100 Miami Center
7	201 South Biscayne Boulevard
8	Miami, Florida 33131
9	(305) 373-1000
10	
11	FOR THE PHILIPS DEFENDANTS:
12	BAKER BOTTS LLP
13	BY: CHARLES A. LOUGHLIN, ESQ.
14	JOHN M. TALADAY, ESQ.
15	TIFFANY GELOTT, ESQ.
16	1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
17	Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
18	(202) 639-1104
19	charles.loughlin@bakerbotts.com
20	john.taladay@bakerbotts.com
21	tiffany.gelott@bakerbotts.com
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 6
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2	
3	FOR THE PANASONIC DEFENDANTS:
4	WINSTON & STRAWN
5	BY: MATTHEW R. DALSANTO, Ph.D., ESQ.
6	35 W. Wacker Drive
7	Chicago, Illinois 60601
8	(312) 558-6211
9	mdalsanto@winston.com
10	
11	WINSTON & STRAWN
12	BY: MOLLY M. DONOVAN, ESQ.
13	200 Park Avenue
14	New York, New York 10166
15	mmdonovan@winston.com
16	(212) 294-4692
17	
18	FOR CHUNGHWA PICTURE TUBES, LTD:
19	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
20	BY: RACHEL S. BRASS, ESQ.
21	555 Mission Street
22	San Francisco, California 94105-0921
23	(415) 393-8200
24	rbrass@gibsondunn.com
25	

	Page 7
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2	
3	FOR HITACHI LIMITED, HITACHI ASIA, HITACHI DISPLAYS,
4	HITACHI AMERICA, HITACHI ELECTRONIC DEVICES US:
5	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
6	BY: ELIOT A. ADELSON, ESQ.
7	555 California Street
8	San Francisco, California 94104
9	(415) 439-1413
10	eliot.adelson@kirkland.com
11	
12	FOR THE LG DEFENDANTS:
13	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
14	BY: HOJOON HWANG, ESQ.
15	33 New Montgomery Street
16	Nineteenth Floor
17	San Francisco, California 94105-9781
18	(415) 512-4009
19	hwanghx@mto.com
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 8
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2	
3	FOR THE SAMSUNG SDI DEFENDANTS:
4	SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
5	BY: MONA SOLOUKI, ESQ.
6	NADEZHDA NIKONOVA, ESQ.
7	Four Embarcadero Center
8	17th Floor
9	San Francisco, California 94111
10	(415) 434-9100
11	msolouki@sheppardmullin.com
12	nnikonova@sheppardmullin.com
13	
14	FOR AL SIEGEL AS TRUSTEE OF THE CIRCUIT CITY
15	LIQUIDATING TRUST:
16	KLEE, TUCHIN, BOGDANOFF & STERN LLP
17	BY: KATHRYN ZWICKER, ESQ.
18	1999 Avenue of the Stars
19	Thirty-Ninth Floor
20	Los Angeles, California 90067
21	(310) 407-4076
22	kzwicker@ktsblaw.com
23	
24	
25	

	Page 9
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2	
3	FOR AL SIEGEL AS TRUSTEE OF THE CIRCUIT CITY
4	LIQUIDATING TRUST:
5	SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
6	BY: KENNETH S. MARKS, ESQ.
7	1000 Louisiana Street
8	Suite 5100
9	Houston, Texas 77002
10	(713) 653-7854
11	kmarks@susmangodfrey.com
12	
13	FOR THE TOSHIBA DEFENDANTS:
14	WHITE & CASE LLP
15	BY: KRISTEN J. McAHREN, ESQ.
16	701 13th Street, NW
17	Washington DC 20005-3807
18	(202) 626-3706
19	kmcahren@whitecase.com
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 10	
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):	
2		
3	FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA:	
4	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	
5	BY: MICHAEL WAYNE JORGENSON	
6	(APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY)	
7	455 Golden Gate Avenue	
8	Suite 1100	
9	San Francisco, California 94012-7004	
10	(415) 703-5629	
11	michael.jorgenson@doj.ca.gov	
12		
13	FOR THE DEFENDANTS THOMSON CONSUMER ELECTRONICS,	
14	INC. AND THOMSON SA:	
15	FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP	
16	BY: RYAN M. HURLEY, ESQ.	
17	(APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY)	
18	300 N. Meridian Street	
19	Suite 2700	
20	Indianapolis, Indiana 46204	
21	(317) 237-1144	
22	Ryan.Hurley@faegrebd.com	
23		
24		
25		

	Page 11
1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2	
3	FOR MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC CORPORATION, MITSUBISHI
4	ELECTRIC VISUAL SOLUTIONS AMERICA, INC., MITSUBISHI
5	ELECTRIC US, INC:
6	JENNER & BLOCK LLP
7	BY: SHAUN M. VAN HORN, ESQ.
8	(APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY)
9	353 N. Clark Street
10	Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456
11	(312) 840-8896
12	svanhorn@jenner.com
13	
14	
15	ALSO PRESENT:
16	JULIAN SHINE, VIDEOGRAPHER
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 276

10	EXAMINATION	17:48:53
11	BY MS. BRASS:	17:48:53
12	Q. Hi. I'm Rachel Brass for the Chunghwa	17:48:54
13	Picture Tubes defendants.	17:48:58
14	A. Hello.	17:48:58
15	Q. Dr. McClave did not separately compute any	17:48:59
16	overcharge for the CPT defendants, correct?	17:49:04
17	A. I don't know what you mean. He separately	17:49:08
18	calculated a CPT overcharge separate from a CDT	17:49:12
19	overcharge.	17:49:16
20	Q. Let me rephrase.	17:49:16
21	He computed one overcharge for all	17:49:18
22	defendants, correct, for CPT and for CDT?	17:49:21
23	A. For all defendants for all CDT sales was my	17:49:25
24	understanding.	17:49:32
25	Q. Correct. And he didn't attempt to	17:49:32
	VEDITEVT DEDODTING COMPANIA	

		Page 277
1	separately calculate an overcharge for the Chunghwa	17:49:34
2	Picture Tubes defendants, correct?	17:49:38
3	A. That's my understanding.	17:49:42
4	Q. And you did not attempt to separately	17:49:43
5	calculate an overcharge for the Chunghwa Picture	17:49:44
6	Tubes defendants, correct?	17:49:47
7	A. I didn't separately calculate an overcharge	17:49:47
8	for anybody.	17:49:51
9	Q. Great.	17:49:51
10	Did you make any attempt to identify the	17:49:56
11	specific size of tubes that Chunghwa Picture Tubes	17:49:57
12	sold?	17:50:00
13	A. No. Well no, I did not.	17:50:00
14	Q. And you testified that you did not attempt	17:50:03
15	to determine which of the plaintiffs you wrote a	17:50:08
16	report for bought CRT products containing CRT tubes	17:50:11
17	manufactured by Chunghwa Picture Tubes, correct?	17:50:17
18	A. Just in the aggregate allocation method	17:50:20
19	that we discussed earlier today.	17:50:22
20	Q. Did you do any specific analysis of whether	17:50:23
21	any of the direct vendors appearing in Exhibit 15 of	17:50:29
22	any of your reports actually sold to any plaintiffs	17:50:33
23	any products containing either color display tubes	17:50:37
24	or color picture tubes manufactured by Chunghwa	17:50:41
25	Picture Tubes?	17:50:45

		Page 278
1	A. Well, I haven't numerically analyzed that	17:50:45
2	question. But as a qualitative matter, there's a	17:51:09
3	high likelihood if Chunghwa was manufacturing tubes	17:51:15
4	that were incorporated into CRT products in the	17:51:19
5	world, that among the tens of millions of such	17:51:24
6	products that the plaintiffs collectively bought for	17:51:28
7	which I've written reports, that some of those had	17:51:32
8	Chunghwa tubes. But I haven't made any attempt to	17:51:35
9	identify them.	17:51:37
10	Q. You've made no quantitative analysis of	17:51:38
11	that question, correct?	17:51:40
12	A. Just in the market share sense that I've	17:51:41
13	talked about.	17:51:43
14	Q. Okay. I'll ask you about that in a minute.	17:51:43
15	Did you take into account, for example,	17:51:45
16	that there's no evidence that Chunghwa sold CRTs of	17:51:48
17	any kind, color picture tubes or color display	17:51:54
18	tubes, to any Mitsubishi entity listed in the direct	17:51:56
19	vendor names in, say, Exhibit 15 of the Best Buy	17:52:00
20	report related to Best Buy I mean, sorry, to	17:52:05
21	Mitsubishi or NEC or Packard Bell NEC.	17:52:08
22	Did you examine that at all?	17:52:14
23	MR. SMITH: Objection. Form.	17:52:15
24	THE WITNESS: No, I didn't. I did not.	17:52:16
25	BY MS. BRASS:	17:52:18

		Page 279
1	Q. Do you know if CPT sold tubes to any Zenith	17:52:18
2	entity?	17:52:21
3	A. I do not know.	17:52:21
4	Q. Do you know which entities Chunghwa Picture	17:52:22
5	Tubes sold tubes to?	17:52:24
6	A. No, I have not done that analysis.	17:52:26
7	Q. Turning then to the market share	17:52:29
8	adjustments that you made, do you know what Chunghwa	17:52:30
9	Picture Tubes' market share was in the U.S. for	17:52:36
10	picture tubes over 21 inches?	17:52:40
11	A. I do not.	17:52:44
12	Q. Did you take its market share in various	17:52:47
13	sizes of tubes into account in your qualitative or	17:52:50
14	quantitative analysis?	17:52:56
15	A. I don't believe I've seen data on their	17:52:57
16	market shares by size, so I did not.	17:53:02
17	Q. Do you know what their share of tube	17:53:04
18	picture tubes over 22 inches worldwide was during	17:53:10
19	the period that you computed damages for?	17:53:14
20	A. No.	17:53:15
21	Q. And did you separately compute pass-through	17:53:17
22	for tubes never mind. We'll strike that.	17:53:24
23	Did you attempt to break out Chunghwa's CDT	17:53:32
24	market share distinct from other CRT manufacturers	17:53:35
25	in any way?	17:53:39

		Page 280
1	A. I'm sorry. I guess I don't understand what	17:53:39
2	you mean.	17:53:54
3	Q. Did you did you compute Chunghwa's CDT	17:53:54
4	market share for finished monitor products	17:54:09
5	separately for Chunghwa Picture Tubes?	17:54:12
6	A. I I have data on their CDT market share	17:54:14
7	and I used that in the way I've described. I didn't	17:54:22
8	allocate damages numbers pro rata according to these	17:54:25
9	market shares in any way. But you you said	17:54:30
10	finished products. I'm not quite sure what you	17:54:33
11	mean.	17:54:36
12	Q. Do you know what percentage of monitors	17:54:36
13	contained Chunghwa did you compute what	17:54:40
14	percentage of monitors contained Chunghwa CDTs?	17:54:43
15	A. I computed the the it's in this	17:54:47
16	table. So I computed the share of CDT's units	17:54:52
17	accounted for by Chunghwa. But I didn't multiply	17:54:58
18	the percentages by the total number of units to	17:55:03
19	to calculate that out.	17:55:07
20	Q. Okay. And did you offer a separate damages	17:55:09
21	calculation for any specific defendant? Any	17:55:12
22	A. That may be a legal question.	17:55:20
23	There's as I said before, Exhibit 20b	17:55:24
24	to to most of my reports breaks out some of the	17:55:27
25	damages totals by certain parties that are	17:55:33

		Page 281
1	affiliated with certain defendants. Beyond that, I	17:55:35
2	didn't try to allocate damages to particular CRT	17:55:39
3	manufacturers.	17:55:42
4	Q. Okay. And you did not offer any specific	17:55:43
5	opinion in any of your reports as to damages	17:55:46
6	attributable to Chunghwa Picture Tubes, correct?	17:55:50
7	A. Well, I think that's that involves a	17:55:56
8	legal issue about joint and several liability	17:55:59
9	because I haven't tried to if you're asking what	17:56:01
10	component, what dollar amount Chunghwa owes of the	17:56:07
11	total that I've computed, I haven't tried to do	17:56:11
12	that.	17:56:14
13	Q. That's not actually what I'm asking, but I	17:56:14
14	think your answer is fine.	17:56:18
15	If Chunghwa were not joint and severely	17:56:21
16	jointly and severely liable, if that were my	17:56:24
17	hypothetical, you have not offered any specific	17:56:27
18	opinion as to damages attributable to Chunghwa	17:56:31
19	sales, correct?	17:56:34
20	A. Are you asking if Chunghwa is not liable at	17:56:36
21	all?	17:56:38
22	Q. Joint and severely liable for as you	17:56:38
23	understood the term, since you introduced it.	17:56:45
24	A. Well, so if if well, what I I	17:56:48
25	haven't done that math. I'd have to think about	17:57:00

		Page 282
1	whether I have enough information to do that math.	17:57:03
2	I might.	17:57:05
3	Q. But it's not presently in any report or	17:57:05
4	supplemental report you've served in you've	17:57:07
5	written in this in any of the CRT cases in which	17:57:09
6	you've offered a report, correct?	17:57:14
7	A. As I sit here, I think it would be a simple	17:57:16
8	calculation of taking the ratio of, for example,	17:57:18
9	16.3 percent to 88.5 in a particular quarter that	17:57:20
10	I'm looking at and multiplying it out. But I	17:57:24
11	haven't done that calculation yet.	17:57:27
12	Q. And you haven't looked at any specific	17:57:29
13	sizes that Chunghwa manufactured or a specific	17:57:31
14	pass-through rate for Chunghwa, you'd have to assume	17:57:36
15	that it was a common pass-through, right? I mean	17:57:39
16	sorry. Strike that.	17:57:41
17	You would have to assume is that there was	17:57:42
18	a common overcharge, correct? You would not have a	17:57:44
19	specific Chunghwa overcharge to use for that	17:57:46
20	analysis?	17:57:48
21	A. Can you ask again because the I'm not	17:57:52
22	sure which part of the first part of your question	17:57:55
23	is still there.	17:57:56
24	Q. We'll start totally over.	17:57:57
25	A. Thank you.	17:57:58

Case 4:07-cv-05944-JST Document 3526-2 Filed 02/13/15 Page 20 of 22

		Page 283	
1	Q. If you were to do that, you would use	17:57:59	
2	Dr. McClave's existing overcharge analysis, correct?	17:58:01	
3	A. Yes, the the feedstock to my analysis is	17:58:05	
4	the dollars-per-tube overcharge as I've computed	17:58:08	
5	from the two pieces I got from him.	17:58:12	
6	Q. Okay. Great. Thank you.	17:58:13	
7	A. Thank you.	17:58:16	

	Page 292
1	DECLARATION
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	I hereby declare I am the deponent in the
7	within matter; that I have read the foregoing
8	deposition and know the contents thereof, and I
9	declare that the same is true of my knowledge except
10	as to the matters which are therein stated upon my
11	information or belief, and as to those matters, I
12	believe it to be true.
13	I declare under the penalties of perjury of
14	the State of California that the foregoing is true
15	and correct.
16	Executed on the day of
17	2014, at
18	
19	California.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	ALAN S. FRANKEL

	Page 293
1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
2	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)
3	
4	I, Shanda Gabriel, Certified Shorthand
5	Reporter, Certificate No. 10094, for the State of
6	California, hereby certify:
7	I am the deposition officer that
8	stenographically recorded the testimony in the
9	foregoing deposition;
10	Prior to being examined the witness was by
11	me first duly sworn;
12	The foregoing transcript is a true record
13	of the testimony given.
14	Before completion of the deposition, review
15	of the transcript was [] was not [X] requested. If
16	requested, any changes made by the deponent (and
17	provided to the reporter) during the period allowed
18	are appended hereto.
19	Dated July 22, 2014.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	SHANDA GABRIEL
25	CSR 10094